6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ple, in the plains between the Drava and Sava rivers, showed cultural and personality traits similar to those of the Old-Slavonic plowmen.[30]

In their migration, these early Slav soil cultivators were often able to Slavicize the natives among whom they had settled and even to absorb the numerically small bands of steppe raiders who had conquered them. These assimilated invaders were then often employed to fight against new nomadic incursions.[31] It was in the course of such acculturations, due to migrations and conquests, that in the regions between the Volga and the Dnieper a peculiar fusion of contrasting cultural patterns of the steppe horsemen and of the tillers of the soil had developed. Structural relations, personality traits and the religious, social and political ideologies that resulted out of this blend of the two conflicting worlds formed the basis of Russian society and have been at the root of its political instability throughout centuries.[32]

4
TURCO-MONGOL INVASIONS AND FORMATION OF RUSSIAN SOCIETY

I

THE MOUNTED warriors of the steppes were accustomed to covering great distances on their raids and migrations. After they had devastated and annihilated much that was in their way, they would impose their rule with ease over whatever was left. Then they would proceed to organize nomadic federations, principalities and empires.[1] The political systems which thus arose in the area between the Ural mountains and the Carpathians apparently followed the pattern that had been originally established by the Scythians and Huns in the same territory.[2]

Being extremely self-centered and insecure, a strong driving

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

force behind the war expeditions of these predatory warriors might have been their need for self-assertion and dominance, as well as an urge for destruction. They were therefore likely to indulge in sadistic cruelty and in mass plunder, in lechery and debauchery.

It is important to notice, however, that in these conquests the mounted nomads would often invade and settle distant areas without their womenfolk. Therefore, when these womenless, predatory, patriarchal and polygynous horsemen invaded the plains and river valleys between the Ural mountains and the Carpathians, where the Old-Slavonic soil cultivators, Fino-Ugric hunters and other folks were settled, the newcomers not only imposed themselves as political rulers, but it became necessary for them to abduct native women *en masse*, to buy them, or to demand them as a tribute, and make them their wives, concubines, and slaves. Not only the historical records but the Great-Russian marriage customs, folk poetry and other oral literature testify to this trend of events. Marriage by capture, bride price and the use of women as slave laborers figure prominently in all these documents.

At first a great cultural diversity in the society at large resulted out of such a situation. Many early observers of the peoples of this area noticed this phenomenon. Often the customs of the peoples that went under the same name were very dissimilar. The same names covered a conglomeration of tillers of the soil, pastoral nomads, nomadic hunters, and warlike tribes. Some of these people were matriarchal, others patriarchal. Some of them lived in wagons and tents, others built houses. Some cremated their dead, others practiced inhumation. Some were cannibalistic, others vegetarians.[3]

It is for this reason that early observers when speaking of "Slavs" sometimes give contradictory data.[4] Such accounts are likely to confuse a student of early Slav society unless he keeps in mind the ethnical mixture and blending of cultures that was taking place in that area in the course of many centuries. Tacitus, for instance, noticed that "The Veneti [Slavs] have borrowed largely from Sarmatian character; in their plundering expeditions they roam over the whole extent of forests and mountains. . . ."[5]

3 [i.e. of the Turko-Mongols — Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF] Great Russia RF]

In a similar manner the old Kiev Chronicle points out the cultural differences between a number of Slavic-speaking tribes, such as the Polians—the "field-people," and the Drevlians (Drevlyane)—the "inhabitants of the forests," in the middle Dnieper basin. While the former are described as peaceful and mild, organized along egalitarian lines, the latter are represented as ferocious and wild, organized along monarchial, predatory, warlike, and polygynic principles. The Drevlians, says the Chronicle, ". . . lived like beasts; friends killed one another (*ubivahu drug druga*) . . . no marriage took place amongst them, but they captured young girls on the banks of the rivers."[6] And as for some other tribes, such as the Radimichi, the Vyatichi, and the Sever, the Chronicle says that ". . . shameful things occurred amongst them between fathers and daughters-in-law . . . there was no marriage . . . but the villagers would get together for dancing and satanic games, and there they captured their wives . . . they had generally two or three wives . . . they burned their dead."[7]

It is to be expected that under such circumstances cultural dualism and internal conflict and tension occurred within many individual families in this area. A Slavonic woman as wife or concubine of a Turco-Mongol horse-breeder and warrior might know nothing about his nomadic and predatory way of life, about horses and mares, about weapons, wagons and tents. She might therefore introduce into her new family agricultural techniques and a more settled way of life.

Being raised in an equalitarian society with some matriarchal traits, and with emphasis on self-respect and personal autonomy, a Slavonic woman would not be inclined to be completely submissive to her Turco-Mongol husband. Following child rearing customs of her own society the Slavonic woman would tend to remain close to her children, would teach them Slavonic speech, and might even be in a position to give them protection from the arbitrariness and impulsiveness of their warlike father. Such a situation reinforced and even magnified the traditional distance between the Turco-Mongol father and the members of his family.

At the same time the invader would insist on a subordinate

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

791

They used to go starke naked, save a clout about their middle, with their haire hanging long and wildely about their shoulders, and many of them with an iron coller in chaine about their neckes or middles, even in the very extremity of winter. . . . Among others at this time they have one at Mosco that walketh naked about the streets, and inveyeth commonly against the state and government. . . . Another there was, that dyed not many years agoe . . . that would take upon him to reproove the olde emperour, for all his cruelties and oppressions done towards his people. His body they have translated of late into a sumptuous church neere the emperours house in Mosco, and have canonized him for a saint. Many miracles he doth there. . .[15]

166

Another form of protest or of reaction against the existing conditions consisted of mass vagrancy. Many thousands of these restless people were roaming the roads, the forests, and the deserts, as beggars, as pilgrims or as agricultural nomads. Many of them spent whole lives wandering, unable to find peace and rest.

IV

642
178

Conditions in which abusive dominance-submission relationships, self-concern, lack of trust, and destructive aggression thrive do not favor unification and stability of an empire. Yet the Czardom showed a steady and remarkable development in spite of such unfavorable circumstances. In the course of several centuries it had grown from a small principality into a great world power. Just as in the states of steppe nomads, the social agents which were responsible for self-seeking, power-orientation and internal restlessness and explosiveness encouraged also external expansion. But unlike the empires of the steppes, there were in the Empire of the Czars several circumstances which fostered ideological and moral unity, such as the politico-religious philosophy of the Orthodox Church and conditioning on the family and community level. It was perhaps this combination of the explosive and unifying tendencies which was responsible for steady expansiveness and growing consolidation of the Czardom.

[182]

From its very inception the Russian state was a military soci-

000

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Ivan the Terrible]

In this manner popular religious ideas and practices which might have developed as a response to the interpersonal relations in the family and in the Czardom in their own turn tended to perpetuate the existing social and political order, its institutions and practices. There were, however, other aspects of interpersonal relations intrinsic to that social organization which provoked responses that tended not to perpetuate it, but to undermine it and to destroy its very foundations. These important agents of structural change in Russian society will be discussed on the following pages.

11
POWER-SEEKING, MISTRUST, AND DESTRUCTIVE AGGRESSION

I

A CHILD who has been rejected and humiliated by a stern and scornful father, but who has been spoiled by an overindulgent mother might respond to such a situation by developing an exaggerated concern for his own ego, and an extreme intolerance for privations and denials. And in case the mother cannot serve as a satisfactory substitute for rejection by the father, complete detachment from the group, and pity for an abandoned, degraded and suffering self might develop. In such circumstances also a deeply rooted suspicion of others, an unbridled desire for power, and an overwhelming hate and urge for destruction of all those who stand in one's path might take place.

The life histories of a number of Russian rulers and intelligentsia apparently show such an effect of their family environment.[1] Childhood experiences and character traits of Ivan the Terrible, for instance, provide an outstanding example. There is sufficient evidence for the contention that the strange behavior of this Czar was rooted in rejection and in alternating mistreat-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

665 tion which had developed in Russia after the February revolution and to achieve their main objective.

II

182 Just as earlier, in Turco-Mongol empires, the great weakness of the Czardom lay in its low degree of emotional and ideological unity And it is this basic vulnerability of the Czardom which has enabled a small, but determined, well disciplined and ruthless faction of professional conspirators to seize power. Like its patriarchal family the whole Czardom was torn by internal dissension and strife. The abusive and humiliating power relationships at all levels of social organization of the Czardom encouraged self-orientation and destructive aggressiveness which precluded tolerance, compromise and social cohesion.

In such circumstances it was difficult to develop a set of common values that would serve as a focal point of unity of all subjects and keep the society unified in face of all threats to its existence. Orthodox religion, as well as Russian nationalism, failed in its role of unifying ideologies in a society in which interpersonal and intergroup relationships provoked feelings of rejection, mistrust, emotional instability and extreme factionalism. Thus, instead of developing itself into an integrated community unified by common feelings and identification and common interests, there grew within the Czardom a number of separate and inimical worlds with confiicting expectations and demands and with differing images and visions.

184 There was the world of the peasants, the world of the landlords,
565 the world of the lower urban folk, the world of the clergy, the world of the bureaucracy, the world of the military, the world of the intelligentsia, the world of a small upper commercial and industrial class, and finally the separate worlds of ethnical, religious and national minorities. Since Russia had not developed a numerically strong and influential middle class to link and unify all these strata, there was little contact, less understanding and no mutual sympathy between these contrasting worlds. There were deep tensions and conflicts also within each one of these worlds and all were in a perpetual state of hostility and warfare among themselves.[11]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia: RF1

side. The gulf between these two leading groups of the Czardom became impassable.

The intelligentsia themselves were far from being unified or having a common purpose. They were a restless and unstable crowd. They were split into numerous parties, factions and cliques which were in a perpetual state of feuding and warfare among themselves. Since all tended toward extremes and all sought absolute power, each party, faction, and clique considered itself to be the only repository of the Truth and therefore anathematized all others. Dogmatic intolerance and neverending feuding constantly fostered new schisms and heresies, new renegations and treacheries, bitterness, hostilities and extreme factional strife.

Both the peasants and the intelligentsia resented the military. The officers kept apart from the rest of society as a separate caste, and were therefore alienated from the common people. Within the military ranks there was a great deal of distrust and suspicion of common soldiers toward officers. The revolutionary intelligentsia considered the armed forces to be the main bulwark of the autocracy, showed a passionate hatred toward them and were waiting for the first chance to destroy this pillar of the old regime. All the strata of the population equally loathed the dreadful political police. The revolutionary intelligentsia were also distrustful of the clergy and Church hierarchy. Most of them were openly atheistic.

In want of an integrating middle class and a unifying ideology, all these warring strata, groups and factions were held together by the authority of the Czar, which was sanctioned by the Church and rested on the bureaucracy, the police and the armed forces. The influence of the Church, however, was greatly shattered, the bureaucracy was inefficient, self-concerned, full of internal tension, and not fullheartedly behind the existing regime, and the police were resented by all. The fate of the Czardom therefore depended exclusively upon the discipline and the loyalty of the military.

In such conditions, if the support of the armed forces would fail, both the Czar and the Czardom were doomed. This was well realized not only by the opposition, but by the Czar him-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

self. And after the army which Czar Nicholas personally commanded in 1917 had suffered defeats at the hands of the enemies, and the chiefs of the armed forces suggested to the Czar that he should resign, he realized that his prestige had fallen and his authority gone. As out of spite he abdicated not only for himself but for his heirs as well. And as it has already happened in Russia's past, when the central authority suffered defeat and loss of prestige, all seething internal forces of revolt, relieved of the controls that kept them under check, burst out in violent eruptions. In such circumstances everybody deserted the Czar, even the Orthodox Church:

> Even the Orthodox Clergy, that class that had been an integrated part of the Czarist system deserted the Czar in the hour of his doom. Showing as much lack of a sense of proportion as the other classes of Russian society the official hierarchy went as far as to pass a decision according to which all lines containing the word "king" in the Psalms of David were to be deleted.[13]

III

All these circumstances, combined with the extreme factionalism within the intelligentsia, greatly facilitated the seizure of the power by the Bolsheviks. All the four national *Dumas* which were convoked since 1905 were composed predominantly of the intelligentsia and semi-intelligentsia. The same situation existed in the leading circles of all political parties.[14] But in each party, self-centeredness and lust for power led the intelligentsia into constant bickering among themselves and neverending fighting for leadership, a situation that manifested itself in numerous party splits.

It was only in the Bolshevik Party that the Party's Central Committee was well disciplined and unified under one leader who had absolutist and dictatorial powers. This situtation spared the Party too many splits. This Bolshevik system favored the reduction of Party leadership to a rather small number of intellectuals who relied on the semi-intelligentsia and industrial workers in local Party work. It was this dictatorial, centralistic and "aristocratic" organization of the Bolsheviks, as well as the extreme ruthlessness and aggressiveness of its leaders and fanat-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

jects as a means of permanent control. It is felt that only by Russifying the non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union and convincing them of the benefits of close ties with Russian people and Russian institutions[55] a common culture will be developed; on such a basis a feeling of unity, of common interests and of common objectives will grow.

It is in light of such circumstances that the earlier Marxian theory of linguistics had to be revised to suit the new situation. Present language is not considered any more to be just a "superstructure" destined to give way to a completely new language of Socialism. On the contrary, Russian language and even Russian script is looked upon now as the basic language and basic script of Soviet socialism. Contrary to earlier Marxian theory, Russian language is now looked upon as an agent of unification and control under Soviet rule.[56]

Myths of national and racial superiority, however, do not appeal equally to all strata of the population. The toiling multitudes, if dissatisfied with their status, might remain deaf to such calling unless convinced that in different conditions their situation would become worse and even more precarious. It was to strengthen the latter feeling that the Bolshevik Party undertook to propagate a myth of the inferiority, rottenness, and damnation of the non-Soviet world. Building on anti-Latin and anti-Western traditions of the Orthodox Church and of Slavophilism the Bolshevik propaganda has attempted to develop attitudes of horror, disgust, and utter contempt of the capitalist world and of Western culture. Accordingly the Western society has been pictured as exploitative, war-mongering, decadent, decaying, full of internal conflicts and contradictions, and therefore self-destructive. The miserable, exploited, toiling multitudes in Western countries and their dependencies have been pictured as living in inhuman, deplorable and destitute conditions, exposed to constant unemployment and hunger, and heartlessly exploited by pitiless capitalists.

Because of this inherent and unsurmountable conflict of interests between labor's demand for higher standards and the capitalist's demand for higher profits, there is an intrinsic self-destroying tendency in the very nature of capitalism, the Bolshe-